

How to debate like me.

I have been debating for ten years on december 10th 2016 and feel i have a lot of methods to share with everybody. seeing as how i have been on a lot of forums, i would like to say that there are a lot of different styles out there. usually the dominant posters will dictate the styles that are used, like on this forum, it is common for debaters to simply make a comment that is obvious without justifying it, like this;

"Obviously trump likes to kill people, because his police are killing people."

"Trumps loves people and will not kill them."

The question immediately in my mind is "why?" why does trump love or hate people? this calls for justification, maybe with some psychology, or evidence, but preferably some "science." if you were to justify yourselves with science, not quotes, but rather your interpretation of quotes you read, you could justify yourself and make your point much clearer, yes?

Let's go further into 'style?'

My method is usually to use 'steps' or 'the ladder.' this is where i say what i want to do in the beginning, then i use common analogies and common general knowledge to take a step away from something simple to declare the foundation for my understanding of the topic. then, i will try to arrive by a conclusion based on those steps, yes? i find this is a great way to inform those not in the know, basic science wise, of how i have arrived by my conclusion. the problem here is that it is very long, but the good side is it is very safe, yes?

Another style i am aware of quite similar, but i only use it when i am angry. this is 'overload.' if you were to be debating someone that is irritating, then you could bombard them with facts supporting you, concisely. this would mean that you would state fact upon fact you declare supports you, in short sentences. often people break what you are saying apart and derail you or try to derail the thread by fixating on a point you think you made quite well, and they stray from the topic because they just want to win. i hate this, as it is supposed to be a learning experience for everyone, of course.

Yet another style is to 'just use evidence.' this would be where you research your position on the net through stats you gather and then let them support you. for example, i was looking for a way to explain the way i see the near east morally, as they seem to be very moral to the naked eye, yes? then i decided that publishing the statistics of the murder rate, rape rate and other issues of the region would back me up, and they did.

So the three styles i have elaborated on, if you care, are 'cooperation,' 'melee,' and 'community populism.'

Vindication.

I have tried to start a topic that gets to the bottom of all current events and political scandals because i want to vindicate all persons that can still do good for their regions as they will enjoy having a second chance - how often can you kill your husband, and, even though unrepentant, kill him again?

Let's start with the two presidents of africa that will not step down? they both pay the military, that supports them, and they plan to stay in power a while longer, of course. if they did not have the disciplined soldiers they do have, they would be in a spot of bother from a potential coup, but, that is out of the question, as, when fighting breaks out, they all fall back to protect the leaders that pay them, yes?

On the other hand, this is a great time to set the record straight. if they were to, as they will not step down, give the people something to believe in, so they will vote for them again, now is a good time to spend some of that money that was stolen... what money you ask? it only take a quick bit of estimation to find out which state sectors or departments are stealing money, as, for example, the health care budget would allow for everybody in the country to get medicine for tuberculosis in that year, or even have a decent operation, and that still will not see the amounts pumped into it be rational. this means, someone is stealing - by declaring that they want to make things right before they leave, they could buy some time before the election, and be hailed as heroes that have done what no other leaders before them could do, of course.

They should also seek the promotion of clerics and priests to help them recover from their 'iron fisted attitudes and exploits.' this will see them justify themselves as the heralds of a new dawn, that they really want to be a part of, and, that they believe the other side will merely be corrupt too, unless it is stopped now.

But, on the other hand, what is so great about power? you get to sit in a boring chamber all day, talking about boring street names and the latest scandal that has befallen parliament... what is so great about that? true, you get control of huge parades with you as the center piece, and you do get a great deal of money, but, they must have money already and can stay involved - if they want to stay on, but live outside the parliament, they should defer to being generals and controlling the parades and other stately things, they will still have a say in the goings on of the country.

Being delegated to a lesser role does not keep you out of the spotlight, as maybe that is what the two african leaders want? is it in the best interests of the party to have them there at the helm; if they were to retire one day due to ill health, would it leave the party in turmoil? on the rise might be a war otherwise, and that would look bad to their neighbors and the rest of the world, they would see their distant family killed and then hiding away in the city from prospective bomb attacks could be like living in hell; all that because they want to watch a parade?

But, it is up the leaders when they step down.

This whole benghazi thing is a mystery to me that it is so important. it was a terror attack that nobody seemed prepared for. if clinton was responsible for the well being of the embassy, then why was she not there - this means that she was busy doing things for ameirca in america, letting the embassy look after itself. that there was a anti islam movie that sparked this attack is not her fault, as, she did not promote the video and she did not even know about the video.

If there needs to be more security at each embassy in the arab world because of one video, then they might send a third of the american soldiers to the embassies. what about their own parliaments - if she knew that they were in danger, would she have to look after them too, or, would that be a violation of her job?

Secretaries do not cover security of embassies - they sign papers or forward them onto decision makers for them to sign and make changes to, of course. if she was working with the c.i.a. then she would have needed c.i.a. training, yes?

How can a plumber be blamed for a leak in the roof? they seem similar, but they are not.

Science.

I have been thinking a while now, how do we identify which chemicals do what in a mixture? we have observed that certain elements coming together create various things, and upsetting this could lead to something like nuclear explosions, yes? this makes me wonder, not about nuclear explosions, but rather about what we could make out of things - better rubber, stronger metals, more conductive silicone?

So, it comes down to looking for a pattern or formula. this could be where if we take any metal, and expose it to enough water, it will rust, for example. now, what if we took the same metals and exposed them to hydrogen and oxygen, gases around them will not corrode them, will they? this is a case where a bonded element making a molecule of water will affect something that normally would be unaffected by them individually or by themselves.

If we were to combine liquids, we could make wine. if we were to combine gases, we could make morphine. if we were to combine metals, we could make steel, yes? of course, if we were to combine liquids or gases with each other, we could make wonderful things, and the same with things like lithium and zinc, making a liquid conductor, yes? maybe mixing water with 'tin foil' would make a better conductor for various things?

Anyway, you need to understand that taking even a atomic feature out of the whole molecule, which can be as complicated as can be, there needs to be a method to this madness. if we were to observe that adding heavier atoms to lighter atoms will bring them to the average, and, that this could show definite signs of 'methods' of achieving things like, for example, oil, which has been done already by some other scientists, we could understand that mixing of very heavy with very light elements will have imbalanced outcomes, and therefore they should be closer together to produce a stable molecule, of course.

~ This is all theory, of course, only tests will tell!

Now, if we were to remove certain elements from oil, we should be able to make it give off steam of gases around it, making an eternal engine, yes? this means it would be a mere conductor, and, heat the gases around it, making them give off steam. if this found it's way into a power plant or oil refinery, and it heated water vapor, it could produce rain, for example, too.

So, the characteristics that we are looking for are mainly, volume, weight and amount of protons. this will lead to a unique element if you were to alter already existing elements slowly, maybe even being able to make your own? copying the weight of existing molecules, maybe even replacing hard to find atoms, will lead to a great many formulas for realizing the goals you have.

For example, if you were to want to make steel, which requires some things that may be expensive, and would be great to roll off a conveyor belt, you could mix the right liquids and carbon to make the carbon absorb the liquids and then have some excess liquids, if applied correctly, form 'gluey bonds' between the carbon, or, create 'excessive gluey bonds,' they could take on a form of, for example, 'honey,' then turn to 'honey comb' and then to something harder and then something even harder. this comes from overlaying each layer with similar combinations or mixtures, of course.

Moving on to potential compositions, we could make steel handle more stress, in terms of bending without buckling, so it is 'not so brittle to chop up,' and will supply the same strength, by adding or

removing certain atoms. this would be possible by observing there is a lot of oxygen and carbon in "rubber," yes? rubber handles stress well, and, is more flexible than steel, of course.

Now, if we were to add these flimsy things, a few of them, to iron, we could make a new steel. this would be especially good for ships and so forth, as, the bending nature of the ships hull would make damage to the ships much less - like a battle ship that gets shot with a cannon - it would buckle before breaking, of course. then, the potential for body armors, with the spreading of stress easily from one area to another, would be good for a lot of things.

With this new 'puzzle approach' to science, or, a 'do it yourself recipe,' you might be trying to replicate things that have been proven or trying to get completely new things working. previously, we learned how to make a more malleable metal, but, what if we want to make an even stronger metal, so something that could not easily bend, but rather so solid it would withstand even disasters?

This new metal would be proven to be graphene. this material is made of only carbon atoms, which means it will only have diamond properties while at the same time being designed to bend too - what if it did not bend?

To make a graphene level material that does not bend, we would have to add iron to it. this simple dual atom base would result in $[3C2Ni]$ or something similar, to provide the material with the easily affordable carbon from air, and, the nickel, which is as far as i know the strongest cheap metal out there, and leaving it malleable enough to form. this would result in a lot of nickel that would not melt and sink to the bottom of the mixture, so, we need to use magnetism to draw the nickel into the middle of the carbon while it settles. this will result in quite an expensive material though, so, we need to find another way to bring the nickel to mix with the carbon.

~ I am supposing that a ratio of one more carbon atom than nickel atom is preferred, as that will give a tiny ability to bend just a little bit. of course, if we were just to use nickel, and design it like the graphene, we could make an even stronger material that would be much more expensive then graphene. of course, building out of graphene might be what we are looking for, as, this will help with natural disasters not crippling power lines and so forth.

Of course, graphene is not known to be a conductor, so, maybe we need a conductive material? this would come down to silicone, which could be gathered from something as cheap as sand being boiled. boiling sand makes quartz sink to the bottom - a very brittle metal - and the silicone which is a semi conductor could be used for trains and electrical power lines. this would be cheaper than copper and worthless to people that steal the cables, as it would be so easy to produce, yes?

But, back to our strong metal. i suppose using tin would be a good example of something that is malleable yet non conductive, as it does not burn. not absorbing heat means it will resist friction, making it good for those sort of things. maybe coating buildings insides with tin would result in them not burning down at all? then there would be no problems from protests, of course.

If we want to make the ultimate metal, i suggest we use aluminium for this metal, as it is the first metal, so is probably the most plentiful, and, therefore the cheapest. carbon is used as it is so plentiful and the designers of graphene were looking for something strong and cheap, but for the 'ultimate metal for price' we should consider the same techniques with aluminium.

It has come to my attention that there are gases and liquids between the metals of the periodic table, yet, there seems to be no sure guidelines for boiling points, as silicone, with a much greater number than aluminium, has a much lower boiling point. this means, well either there is a pattern, or it is

chaos and nothing in the world matters! so, fearing the latter, let us begin delving through the table to look for 'a pattern?'

The way i see it, the periodic table follows that each additional electron bears a different outcome. they steadily get heavier, yet some of them fade so quickly, right between metals. this must come down to a 'triangular conductivity formula,' where the set up of those orbitals or electrons would lead to an atom that is more conductive than the previous one. obviously, electron bonds increase the amount of conductivity that the material has, or, 'makes more bridges for the heat people to walk across and into the next similar piece of that stuff.'

Of course, putting this to the test would show that each time a new orbital or proton of a different cloud or area becomes available it seems to be in use immediately to mix with the other types. this means that it will introduce more avenues for conductivity, somehow making the boiling and melting points much lower, as, there is more conductivity.

Now it comes to our attention that due to proton and electron density, maybe we could alter the make up of things; we would either make things into different things, or, strip away the weight of the material. this is because i have a hunch that a material is either the sum of its particles, or, that the material will get lighter or heavier due to particles being added or taken away.

So, with the latter case being tested, if we stripped some particles away from metals like gold, would they become lighter? to subtract the particles we could use a very powerful magnet, by charging the magnet we could maybe redirect the particles to be bonded elsewhere, with the help of electromagnetism, of course.

In the prior case, we might be able to alter the very properties of the material by stripping or adding particles - would they result in the same thing that has the same amount of particles configured?

Okay, so back to alloys? if you were to observe steel is carbon and iron, it would be easy to find a cheaper stronger material, of course. what we should use, for making these materials, is aluminium and magnesium, very available, and hopefully i can explain why?

The less electrons and protons the material has the less of a conductor it is, depending on the amount of electrons they have 'in sync.' it stands to reason that we want something that is not heat resistant, as then it can be smelted quicker, and we need something that is hard too. aluminium i know i used to work in a factory that used it, and it has a high boiling point, but, it is in great supply. the magnesium is not poisonous as you find it in the body; being able to be changed that easily makes for a highly bendable material.

~ I am still undecided as to whether we want to make the material bend to relieve stress or to make it harder to withstand stress and handle more? i suppose we should try to let the material release its stress rather than forcing something to withstand it?

So, this concoction or mixture will result in magnesium and aluminium being the strong cheap metal that the body produces, like proteins, the usual building blocks of the body, or, fuels of the body giving the metals doctors speak of, yes? this means the magnesium could be used for engineering, releasing a special type of magnetism, a biological type of machine - hey, i have a new idea!

Building motors out of magnesium would give a natural charge to the engine, as, it would be a good conductor and having 2/8/2 electrons leads to twelve bonds, where aluminium has 2/8/3 electrons. this means there is nothing hanging on nothing, and, each thing balances out without

having to rearrange itself to go to the other areas, and, waiting, leaving a charge that 'has no home.' this would result in discharges of energy from the atom, of course.

If we were to look at steel, it has carb with 2/4 electrons, and, 2/8/14/2 - all balanced, yes?

But now, we must find why there is instability with the introduction of each new orbital classification? this, as i showed, is due to the pair not being there for the orbitals to defer energy to, as they travel along the bonds, they will have a lone electron of some sort, and, this means that it will not be balanced with the other electron. this means that all alkali earth metals, with this phenomenon, will be made alkali earth metals for this reason, of course.

Maths.

There are two main things in high school maths, being, calculus and trigonometry. let us gloss over them quickly?

Calculus is about finding the value of the accumulation of quantities, rates of change and slopes and curves. this is then calculated as if it were a function, where the function or slope and all known quantities are placed on a diagram. so, if it were a curve that grows because of angles getting greater, then it would be there to work that out. let us take a example for [1] differential calculus and [2] integral calculus?

[1] If you need to find the function of a curve that is; $f[x] = [x^2]$? typically, we would use quadratic equations to find the values, but, there is an easier way. the easier way to do it is to work out the exact value from the $[x^2 =] 4x$. then you may say that $f = 4$, yes?

[2] If you are doing integral calculus $(d / dx [x + a] [ft] [dt] = f[x])$, (d / d) is one times by x , leaving $[one x]$. that is where the equations regarding x end, so that is the answer for x , being, if there are two $[x]$ on the left, and one on the right, then the rest of the equation is minus one $[x]$, to realize the one $[x]$ on the right.

With trigonometry, you merely need to measure the ratio of 0.6, as that goes 600 times into 360 degrees, yes? so, for every 0.6 degrees you count one percent, and then can use a calculator.

Well, if there is $[x]$ blah blah blah $[x]$ on the one side, and one $[x]$ on the other side, then all that other stuff must equal $2[x]$, so, some of it is $[x]$ and the other amount of it is $[f]$.

With quadratic equations, you find that there is often lots of stuff over other stuff, then another one of those 'split sums.' let us take an example;

$$x = [d^3x/b+x] * [2bx/d]$$

This will mean that $[x]$ is listed thrice on the other side of the $[equals]$ sign, yes? this would mean that all the equations equal $[3x]$ and the answer to all those things is equal to $[3]$, where you take the sum and say that the whole sum equals $[3x]$, so, $[3x]$ equals $[d + b]$, $[x] = ([d + b] / 3)$.

Women's rights observed.

The rights of women is something fought for all over the world in progressive countries, yes? i believe that a woman should fill traditional roles of child minding, shopping and finances of the family. this is naturally what women do, as they have done it nearly all over the world by default, yes?

If a woman is not married, then she may do as she pleases, but, the rights of the child come first in the family, as they are completely helpless, the buying of groceries is important as there is seldom time to do these things for the men, and the balancing of finances is important and should not be left unattended.

When it comes to customs of the third world, sometimes in various towns they take child brides. this is because they have to care for the older men in terms of looking after them - for this they are welcomed into the homes of the older men, and supported financially, while being highly thought of as a woman, yes?

So, the older men do not have sex with them, even though they are 'having periods.' this is because nature and their bodies are telling them they are ready for sex, as, they are developing, and, the routine of every organism on the planet - it's whole reason for existing - is to reproduce or divide, like cells, yes?

Now, the men do not have sex with nine year olds, they would feel vile if they looked into the eyes of a child - they are not like western men that become child molesters due to social rejection. this whole child molester thing is a western concept where the fantasies of mature people play out in the acts they think about due to cartoons and seeing children kissing, dreaming of being a child again to kiss for the first time again - a plea to be popular, yes?

For these reasons, child brides remain favored in my mind.

Micro economics.

There is a lot more going on in micro economics than macro economics, as, the taxes collected to fund state macro economics is based on the taxes taken from the private sector or micro economics. this means, if we ignore the totals of macro economics, and worked on micro economics, both would grow, yes?

So, if we observe the typical business, they have a budget and the profits are represented in percentage points. this is not the way we should look at it, as we need to look at net and so forth, the big take home amounts need to balance out. it just so happens that the business owner takes home all surplus and this means that they would probably not reinvest it into the business unless they wanted to.

Under nationalism the business is taken care of by the state, all administration is done by the state, and, the owner gets a percentage instead of all surplus. this is definitely better for the business, as all profits will be split more, yes? this means nationalism is better for the whole of the country as the country will benefit from declared amounts rather than seeing money stashed away from circulation and tax collecting.

With the supply and sales chains, most businesses need to stay on the cutting edge to maximize gains and net. this would be easier if they were to invest in their suppliers. if they were to buy a five percent stake in a start up to replace their current supplier, they could sign into writing many things that the start up needs now that the business could use to their advantage for now and into the future. basically, the plus for both is that they will prosper, with the start up supplier making a definite order, and the business that bought a five percent stake in their supplier receiving basement prices and being able to supply their customers with less in and the same or more out, yes? this is obviously good for both businesses.

Coordinating this would mean that the businesses could collaborate and research the services coming in for their various competitors, and, getting together with this formula. in the end, many old suppliers will fail due to the lack of customers, the businesses will prosper with their new suppliers, and then the old suppliers will need cash quickly. this is where the businesses buy into the old suppliers too, making long term deals with them, and, merging them with their own startups. this will mean that everyone gets longer contracts, and, then the markets will shore up and prosper too, yes?

The state of the economic world is dire - the economies grow by maybe five percent a year in a good case. this is barely enough to deal for the needs of the new generations, and, this figure is taken away from by the state of the money being paid back from their loans. how can you base the growth of an economy on gains that need to be deducted from?

Anyway, the best way to deal with this is to generate more tax paying citizens and businesses. this could be done with loans, but, instead they spend these loan amounts on things that cost money - they will loan money to build something that also costs money, like a road. these roads need upkeep and get full of potholes, yes? this means they pay for the road and it's upkeep and the loan amount!

So, if the state wants to make money, it should sew the seeds of growth. this can be done by observing the businesses that are too big to fail, finding what they pay in tax, estimate the amounts they will pay, and raise taxes for them. for example, microsoft will take money off what the owner takes home and not really the employees, rather shifting the burden onto the surplus, as there is a lot for blue chip companies, yes? this will bring in many millions in any country, at least, a steady supply of income, of course.

The way money works, you cannot generate more of it physically without printing it, but, in the digital world of a bank, it's value could change quite considerably within seconds or more likely minutes. this is usually how money grows.

When you put your money into a bank, some of it is kept in a safe, or an auto teller, and the majority of it is turned into numbers on a server. this means that the banker could just add or subtract value from your account, yes? when you send the bank cheques or pay slips the amount increases and when you swipe your credit card it goes down, of course.

So, is there a way to add to his total, legally, without putting surety from others into your account? if you own a business, your business is worth as much as you say it is, unless the bank repossesses it. this would mean that estimates are all there is to go on with money, yes? i mean, if a shop keeper tells you it is a million bucks for a loaf of bread, is he wrong or right? it is his property, and, if you do not pay the price, you do not get the goods, of course.

This means that there is no value to anything unless we want it or this value is determined and agreed upon. common sense says we should ask for as much as we can for our goods, and pay as little as possible for the goods of others, of course. so, how much is your services and goods worth?

If you were to observe that where there are needs there is productivity, in the form of 'needs satisfaction,' then you can also estimate there is competition. the main needs being physical and medical should make you agree that society has not changed that much, just the excess and luxuries, of course. with these new goods will come new luxuries, and, this will make humanity seek new ways to satisfy the newly identified needs. if you can generate a new product, and, manage to market it properly, then you will see the sales of it go up, and, the price. if it is not 'valued,' you will

understand that the little banker inside the product has changed your account worth to a lower amount, of course.

So, how do we make it go up? the more valued it is means the higher price it will fetch. if you were to buy all your competitors products in the area, hopefully non perishable items, you could sell them and store them for sale before the competition gets more in, raising the price, of course.

“Originally Posted by <http://www.investopedia.com/ask/answers/042115/which-better-high-or-low-equity-multiplier.asp>

An equity multiplier measures a company's financial leverage by using a ratio of the company's total assets to its stockholders' equity. Generally, a lower equity multiplier indicates a company has lower financial leverage. It is better to have a low equity multiplier, because a company uses less debt to finance its assets.

The equity multiplier is calculated by dividing a company's total assets by its shareholders' equity. This ratio measures the total assets a company owns per dollar of its stockholders' equity. The equity multiplier of a company should only be used in comparison to the industry standard or to companies in the same sector.

For example, suppose company ABC has total assets of \$10 million and stockholders' equity of \$2 million. Its equity multiplier is 5 (\$10 million/\$2 million), which means that company ABC uses equity to finance 20% of its assets and the remaining 80% is financed by debt.

On the other hand, company DEF, which is in the same industry as company ABC, has total assets of \$20 million and stockholders' equity of \$10 million. Its equity multiplier is 2 (\$20 million/\$10 million), which means that company DEF uses equity to finance 50% of its assets and the remaining half is financed by debt.

Company ABC has a higher equity multiplier than company DEF, indicating that ABC is using more debt to finance its asset purchases. A lower equity multiplier is preferred because it indicates that the company is taking on less debt to finance its assets. In this case, company DEF is preferred to company ABC because it takes on less debt and carries less risk.”

So, according to this 'study' high equity means that there is a lot of money tied up with the company? this means that it is not 'liquid,' and, therefore there is a problem 'freeing money up.' if you were to observe that half the business is tied up with money, the assets are there but are not counted, they are only worried about the debt of the company. naturally everyone avoids this type of company, and, then these companies are cheaper - think of a factory with a lot of machines?

If you were to buy the whole company, you could sell the assets separately before you sell the factory, or, make orders to meet the value of the companies debt. this means all you need to do is get those lazy salesmen that never make their own customers and rely on the customers handed to them by the managers to get on the phone and find new customers, yes? this will mean that you will be 'selling orders,' of course.

This i call 'in and out.' buy something nobody wants, meet the debts, sell the whole lot.

Another thing you can do with a high equity business is to first observe that you are not paying much for them, as they are not comely to investors, yes? this means they will be sold for less than other businesses. of course the other extreme to a high equity business is a start up, which is also cheap, but the real costly ones are finance businesses or commerce based businesses, as these have

hardly any assets and work out the back door compared to a factory, as, the work comes in via email, gets processed, then it gets delivered, of course.

So, with these high equity businesses, we could liquidate them, immediately and keep the facility. this would be where you sell the assets to the bank, like machinery, while you keep the venue, yes? then you have a building for free basically, as the assets pay for the factory, of course. this is counter productive though and i would have made this practice illegal, but, hey, if the cabinet doesn't mind...

~ Actually this could work the same way my company handles toxic assets - they buy the business and close the account, selling all the assets. this means that the company goes straight to the chopping block, like a big piece of meat that nobody knew had not expired, yes?

If you were to buy this 'lump of assets' in a high equity company, you might observe that you could total everything up, with capacity, and components, and sell it as if it had customers - hey, you could place a google business site finder and introduce them to finding their own customers, and, if the prices are right, they will get these customers.

My next point stems from hedge funds; hedge funds speculate on potential gains and invest accordingly. this is where a lot of money is at risk, but, is legal and a common practice for big banks. this makes me wonder, as i researched a while ago how many start ups make it in my country, south africa, and found that about eighty percent of them succeed their initial year while making modest profits.

So, why not make a new policy where we invest in startups and subtract the maximum value of businesses closing that year or over the period? this will generate much money for the reserve or state, where they may bank on these startups generating taxes, and, they may bank on taxes from the established businesses?

I have calculated from google that over two decades seventy five percent of businesses fail, so, to be safe, we could say that fifteen percent of businesses fail each year. then, we calculate the fifty thousand rand average of the startup requirements, more or less, and we could say that ten percent of established businesses fail each year - planning for a fall, instead of planning on the shoulders, yes?

So, we could estimate that plus start ups, plus ninety percent of established businesses, and generate money from taxation from there. furthermore, we could allow banks to generate this money that is estimated too, allowing them to loan the money out that they will be receiving, and then upping the money they would have received too.

With micro management, or, business management and finance, you need to get more coming in than going out, unless it is to buy up good deals one month for sale the next month.

I have always been in favor of short term deals, as these let you get in and out quickly, being able to assess the deal as if it were completed, allowing you to stay on the edge of the market, as, then you may reapply your resources to the next deal, as, the market changes every month, with new speculation coming out.

Of course, you want to stay on the edge of deals, so, buying into the startups would be a good idea. never having a set supplier could keep your logistics on it's toes, but, if they don't mind phoning a few times a month will keep you supplied on 'cheap scraps' and being able to control your whole supplier if you work for a medium size business.

On the other hand, if you are part of a startup, then only working with other startups will keep the operating costs down as you buy cheap deals and so forth. if you are a start up, you could take your orders to the bank as surety and then get loans quite easily too.

There is a difference between long term and short term deals and long term deals are usually sought, of course. this is because of the security they bring to the businesses on both sides, but, what if i was to tell you short term deals are much better? let me illustrate;

With a long term deal there is security. while prices change, you get the deal you ired out with the supplier or customer at previous prices and, they can lead to a good relationship, yes?

With a short term deal, you get to adjust prices with the closure of the deal, and opening of the new short term deal. you also get paid out your bonuses faster, and, get to make a new short term deal right after the conclusion of the previous deal.

Now, let us take a look at this mathematically? let $[x]$ be the amount of money from the customer to the supplier, and let $[y]$ be the duration of the deal.

With a long term deal of twelve months, it would stand that $[12x * 12y]$? with the short term deal of two months it would be $[2x * 2y]$, yes? now the amounts involved go up the shorter the term deal is, so, it will gather more financing the shorter it is and the more repeated it is, yes? so;

$[2x * 2y] + [2.5x * 2y] + [3x * 2y] + [4x * 2y] + [5x * 2y] + [6x * 2y] = [22.5 x * 12 y] =$ much better for the supplier.

But, how is this better for the customer? being able to observe the rate of product interest each two months on the accounts forms will show them where they are making money and where they are losing money, of course, letting them adjust for the market place and with their suppliers.

Another idea i have been toying with is 'investment portfolios.' often, you find companies that invest in certain businesses that are startups and then roll them together on their portfolios. this means the main company owns a whole lot of companies under it, many startups and others that decide to stay on before they buy their freedom.

It is a little known fact, that i have researched, by the way, that about seventy five percent of startups make it for the first year of operations. this means there will be a profit unless something is drastically wrong with the companies they invest in, of course.

So, if the portfolio was to buy, with surety, the companies listed, there is basically no limit to the amount of companies they can 'own.' the companies pay for themselves, due to surety and so forth, so, you can collect dozens of companies at any time. my favorite strategy then is to sell the whole portfolio with all the owned companies as if they were established already, promoting them with the stats for their likeliness of survival, of course.

When you buy a company, you may list it's assets against a loan to take out for the company. then, you either move the money into your account, and sell the company, or sell the whole company with associated cash for more than you bought it for, quickly accelerating your own wealth over the price you paid.

This will see you enjoy a windfall of cash, especially if you mix this with collateral. the surety here would be the company you buy, plus the collateral assets, plus the money loaned out for the company you bought.

War on the net.

There is a war raging on the net with islamist extremists and the police all veering for victory over each other. maybe we should discuss my ideas i have had today so far?

'Pie spy' i had a while ago. this is a program where we find relationships over email and telephonic contact, where we can pin the known terrorists to people they speak to a lot, and, then investigate.

'Breakthrough' is where the police find information illegally, and, pay the people or person to testify that they went to the police with a long story, where they found the information they are giving to the police, a little wrong lie for a lot of good.

'Smugglers' was an idea to list the people that stole away to other regions, or left home unexpectedly, and, joined the militants. knowing who they are and where they are is important, as they might know something if involved enough, yes?

These are my two best ideas so far, but there is a problem with the privacy of persons that are incriminated. they simply cannot have their privacy invaded, but, let me give you examples of where it seems to be okay;

At air ports, they search through luggage for drugs yes? at borders, they search the cars for illegal stuff, of course. what is the difference in searching through contact numbers and bank transactions to find terrorists? the right to privacy seems to overshadow the really important right to live safely, so, let us try to get past this problem to security and deal with the fourth amendment?

As of now, america is in no real danger of 'being bombed.' i don't know the specs, but, i know they must have some drug dealers in their prisons from these areas, people that would know where to get a prostitute, a gun, or, indeed, bomb making materials, yes? the thing is timers, the manure used for bombs of today is too easy to get hold of and too hard to regulate, yes? people interested in making bombs would seek the anarchist's cookbook or equivalent wiki leaks stuff - i hope you see how dangerous snowden is now? - and then involve many in these acts.

The ground wars are not really that challenging, as they will come down to actual soldiers fighting people on drugs, yes?

Maybe there is a way to keep people with their right to privacy, while at the same time getting to the bottom of this? When police get a warrant, how is it issued? the way i see it, it comes through [1] a report, [2] a confirmation and then [3] investigation is ordered? this would sit with the report of i.s.i.s. activity or any other illegal activity, and then a confirmation through some means, but this seems to be the stumbling block!

So, if it comes down to confirming a report, the police or authorities may open a few cases that have nothing to them but names of the investigations and a brief description. this will speed up the investigation, as the report will go straight to the 'open case' and it will be following up on suspicions instead of confirming reports, yes?

Then, there is the concept of 'recurring words.' for the past month, people have been plotting or discussing areas to bomb for christmas and new years eve. there are heavy secret codes involved, but, there is the recurrence of slang, yes?

The point here is to find words that get repeated, with pie spy, to find out who is using them the most. these would common words that just get repeated, especially 'slang.' then, we find out the time they are sent at - this will show who used them first, and who repeated them in the chains.

This is similar to american flagging of suspicious content or key words, of course.

Water.

There has for a long time been the need for more water in the world, especially the third world where water can be quite scarce. this means we need to either create water, desalinate sea water or attract water, of course.

To attract water, we could put long poles above dams for the clouds to swarm around. to desalinate sea water, we could build huge floating desalination plants that filter usable sea water into the dams for our use.

To create water out of clouds, we could 'shoot them' with lasers that turn them into water. this would make use of electromagnetism, where the clouds would converge onto one spot where the laser is fired and focused and then there would be water created out of clouds and then there would be much 'cloud condensation.' this would be where we focus a laser that compacts air into the clouds as they pass over the dams.

Motive

Many crimes may be excused or inferred with proper understanding of "motive." with a motive, there is evidence of gains for the criminal, if there is no motive then how could there be a case, as, the gains are not there, yes?

I remember this case i was analyzing and found that this rural king in africa was not driven by motive. it was obviously not revenge, as his people served him well the papers said. a lot of his people died and were hurt, but without a motive, there is no crime. he was in jail at the time, and, he was released shortly afterwards as i sent out chain letters showing he did not have any reason to order the deaths of his people, in fact showing that it was a revenge from his underlings as they were up to no good. this is because they wanted to feel powerful and such things, with them hurting people for some or other reason, as they were in fact hurt.

Then there is wiki leaks. this is a gross violation of trust, with news that could upset many people, drive them away from work and interfere with the economy of the countries that are mentioned. the motive for this 'crime' seems to be that mr snowden wants to be famous and make money, while upsetting a lot of people of the world and making them panic, yes? do you tell someone news for their own good or to sell stories? if he was anonymous, then there would not be a motive, yet he stands to be the star, yes?

Self defense is also excusable. i read about cops killing people all the time, and, they are doing it because they need to defend themselves. maybe if people did not slander them so much, show them threats and keep them on their toes like that, they would relax and be 'more social,' but they are out there with a huge target on their backs. what the hell motive do they have for killing innocent people? how could they want to harm people and not all be out shooting? is it a case where some of the officers should not be officers, or, is there no difference to the person depending on the circumstance? if they want to scare them, the police wonder why they want to scare them - believe me they would ditch the police force for a better paying job, but they are stuck there, or, they love working there. so, there is no motive to shoot people other than self defense, as they are not mad,

none of them, so why would they shoot? consulting a psychologist will show that they are never mad, just scared.

Then there is 'clueless cases.' sometimes due to social means, people seek to vent their anger on others. take these shooting people that go on massacres, they always want to settle old scores. there is a gun, there are dead people, the motive does not matter, does it? the act is done, justice needs to follow. at the same time, there is conception of the idea - where did that come from? if bill gates robbed a small shop, and took all the money, he is a criminal without a motive. with this in mind, could he get off? i mean, after threatening the cashier with a gun shaped u.s.b, would he go to jail? would he be fined, what is his motive, and, without a motive, where does conception come from?

So, it is something that requires some thinking. any lawyer that throws this at someone, this 'motive ideal,' would severely influence the gullible jury or judge, either way, if you ask me. at the same time, if you do not listen and think, are you doing your job?